

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/326,258	06/04/1999		Damion L. Hankejh	SESSIO.P01	3976
	7590	01/29/2003			
Patrick M Dy			EXAMINER		
1818 Westlake Avenue N Suite 114				VU, VIET DUY	
Seattle, WA	98109				
Scattle, WA	70107			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				2154	
•				DATE MAILED: 01/29/2003	<b>,</b>
			• ••		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Application No. App

M

# Office Action Summary

09/326,258

Applicant(s)

Examiner

Viet Vu

Art Unit **2154** 

Hankejh et al

	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears	on the cover sheet with the correspondence address			
Period f	or Reply				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the					
mailing	date of this communication.				
- If NO p - Failure - Any rer	eriod for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within eriod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will appl to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause by received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	y and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status	,				
1) 💢	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>Dec 24, 2</u>	002			
2a) 🗌	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☒ This action	on is non-final.			
	Since this application is in condition for allowance e closed in accordance with the practice under Ex par	xcept for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is te Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposit	ion of Claims				
4) 💢	Claim(s) <u>1-3</u>	is/are pending in the application.			
4	a) Of the above, claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from consideratio			
5) 🗆	Claim(s)	is/are allowed.			
6) 💢	Claim(s) <u>1-3</u>	is/are rejected.			
7) 🗆	Claim(s)	is/are objected to.			
_		are subject to restriction and/or election requirement			
Applicat	tion Papers	•			
9) 🗌	The specification is objected to by the Examiner.				
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/ar	e a accepted or b objected to by the Examiner.			
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the d	rawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
11)	The proposed drawing correction filed on	is: a approved b disapproved by the Examine			
	If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply t	o this Office action.			
12)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exami	ner.			
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120				
13)	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign pr	iority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).			
a) 🗆	☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:				
•	1. $\square$ Certified copies of the priority documents hav	e been received.			
2	2. $\square$ Certified copies of the priority documents hav	e been received in Application No			
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority de application from the International Burea	au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).			
	ee the attached detailed Office action for a list of the				
14)∐	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic				
a) ∟ 15\□	3				
15)∟ ^***	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic	priority under 35 U.S.C. 33 120 and/or 121.			
Attachme  1) Not	ent(s) tice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s).			
	tice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)			
	ormation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	6) Other:			
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			

#### DETAILED ACTION

## Art Rejections:

- 1. The text of 35 USC 102(e) not cited here can be found in the previous office action.
- 2. The rejection of claims 1-2 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being clearly anticipated by <u>Sanderman</u> et al, U.S. pat. No. 5,794,006, paper #24, mailed 11/20/02, is hereby incorporated by reference.
- 3. Claims 1-3 are further rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Anupam et al, U.S. pat. No. 5,862,330.

Per claim 1, Anupam discloses a system and method for using a conventional web browser to perform chat function and collaborative browsing comprising:

- a) a Java-enabled browser for browsing/visiting a web site or server in the network by selecting a special (predetermined) URL (see col 2, lines 19-38),
- b) a collaboration session service, responsive to user's click on a hyperlink address representing a network site, for distributing JAVA applet to user's browser for enabling user to participate in a collaborative browsing and/or an interactive chat session (see col 2, line 39 col 3, line 32 and col 5, lines 21-35).

It is noted that in a conventional web browser, a URL is usually selected/entered by clicking on a hyperlink. In fact, the web browser is especially designed to enable users browsing the network by clicking on hyperlinks instead of having to manually enter a network address, which is very tedious and error-prone.

It is also noted that in the conventional browser, hyperlinks can be represented by many different formats including texts, images, buttons or icons, e.g., HOME, FAVORITE buttons.

Per claim 3, <u>Anupam</u> teaches performing a series of predetermined steps before admitting a new user request for joining an existing session (see fig 2B).

### Response to Amendment:

4. Applicant's arguments filed on 12/24/02 with respect to rejection of claims 1-2 over Sanderman are not deemed persuasive.

Applicant alleges that <u>Sanderman</u> does not teach browser-leading capability as defined in page 1, line 20.

This alleged portion of the specification discussed the collaborative browsing function enabled by iSession. Since iSession is not required in claims 1 and 2, <u>Sanderman</u>'s teachings are deemed sufficient meeting the claim limitations.

Applicant's Declarations and response filed 12/24/02 are moot in view of new ground of rejection set forth above.

As discussed in the previous office action, applicant is required to provide demonstrative evidence in support of the asserted conception date of the invention. See MPEP Although applicant claimed to have conceived the invention as early as in January 1996, there was no hard evidence to support such claim, e.g., source codes, notebooks, etc. From the declarations submitted by applicant, it appears that at least one element of the invention concept, i.e., integrating chat function within a browser, wasn't disclosed to another person until July 1996. Therefore the earliest acceptable conception date for the at least one claimed subject matter (i.e., claim 1) appears to be not earlier than July 1996. Other evidences presented by applicants via affidavits also shows that other elements of the claimed invention, including iSession and Java applets, were not conceived before September 1996 (Fall 1996). Since applicant's declarations fail to show that the invention was conceived before July 1996, Anupam is properly applied as prior art against claims 1-3.

#### Conclusion:

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Viet Vu whose telephone number is  $(703)\ 305-9597$ . The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from  $8:00\,\mathrm{am}$  to  $4:00\,\mathrm{pm}$ .

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An, can be reached on (703) 305-9678.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

Tuto.~

VIET D. VU PRIMARY EXAMINER

Art Unit 2154 1/23/03